



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/617,564	07/17/2000	Paul Hua	GSH 08-886639	8340

7590 11/15/2004

Hayes Soloway Hennessey & Hage
175 Canal Street
Manchester, NH 03101

EXAMINER

GENCO, BRIAN C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2615

DATE MAILED: 11/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/617,564

Applicant(s)

HUA ET AL.

Examiner

Brian C Genco

Art Unit

2615

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 12 October 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Attached.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 9-14.Claim(s) objected to: 4 and 6-8.Claim(s) rejected: 1-3 and 5.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2615

Applicant argues that Yadid-Pecht does not teach a pre-reset of the sensors in the array during the reset cycle as required by independent claims 1 and 5.

In response, Examiner notes that the entire duration of time illustrated in Fig. 5 is a reset cycle. Examiner notes that Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary defines cycle as "an interval of time during which a sequence of a recurring succession of events or phenomena is completed". As such, the duration of time illustrated in Fig. 5 is an interval of time during which there are recurring reset events, therefor, this duration of time is a reset cycle.

Applicant argues that Yadid-Pecht does not teach sequentially applying a pre-reset voltage as required by independent claims 1 and 5.

In response, Examiner notes that this limitation is not claimed. The claim reads that a voltage be applied sequentially. As shown in Fig. 5 in the bottom wave form a voltage RST is applied sequentially. Note that these sequential resetting operations occur prior to the reset via the top waveform to start the next integration period. As such, the sequential conditional resets shown in Fig. 5 are pre-resets.

Applicant argues that Yadid-Pecht does not teach applying a reset voltage to all of the sensor in the array substantially simultaneously as required by independent claims 1 and 5.

In response, it is clear from the cited portions of the reference and the drawings that the reset at the top of Fig. 5 is a global reset.

Applicant argues that Yadid-Pecht further teaches a monitoring of each individual pixel and the subsequent issuance of a conditional reset signal when the oversaturation condition has been met (Page 7, line 2-35). This is not taught for groups of pixels.

In response, Examiner notes that as broadly as claimed the groups can be of one or more sensors. As such, since Yadid-Pecht teaches applying the conditional resets to one sensor it meets the claim limitations.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian C. Genco who can be reached by phone at 703-305-7881 or by fax at 703-746-8325. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8:30am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Christensen can be reached on 703-308-9644. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the customer service office whose telephone number is 703-308-4357.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Brian C Genco
Examiner
Art Unit 2615

November 4, 2004



ANDREW CHRISTENSEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600